Applicant: Kevin J. Oryek Attorney's Docket No.: 10559-932001 / P18721

Serial No. : 10/814,883 Filed : March 31, 2004

Page : 7 of 8

REMARKS

Claims 1-18 are pending. Claims 1 and 9 are independent. Claims 19-29 are withdrawn. The examiner indicated that claims 3, 5, 6, 8, 13, 17 and 18 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form.

Accordingly, applicant amended independent claim 1 to include the features of allowable claim 5 and the features of intervening claim 4 (from which claim 5 depends). Applicant also amended independent claim 1 for greater clarity, for instance, claim 1 was amended to recite that the "pair of conductive lines that are configured to define a channel to capture at least one particle. With these amendments, applicant considers independent claim 1 to be allowable.

Applicant also cancelled claims 4 and 5

Applicant also amended claims 3, 7 and 8 to make the language recited therein consistent with the amended language of independent claim 1. Applicant submits that claims 2, 3, 7 and 8 are allowable as depending from an allowable independent claim.

Applicant added new independent claim 30 which recites features similar to those recited in independent claim 1, claim 4, and allowable claim 6. Applicant cancelled claim 6. Applicant considers new independent 30 to be allowable as including features indicated allowable by the examiner. Applicant also added new claims 31-34, which recite features similar to those recited in claims 2, 3, 7 and 8, respectively. New claims 31-34 depend from new allowable independent claim 30 and are therefore allowable for at least the same reasons as independent claim 30.

Applicant amended independent claim 9 to include the features of allowable claim 17, and the features of intervening claim 16 (from which claim 17 depends). Applicant also amended independent claim 9 for greater clarity, for instance, claim 9 was amended to recite that "the pair of conductive lines are configured to define a channel to capture at least one particle." With these amendments, applicant considers independent claim 9 to be allowable. Applicant also cancelled claims 16 and 17.

Applicant also amended claims 11, 12 and 13 to make the language recited therein consistent with the amended language of independent claim 9. Applicant submits that claims 10-15 are allowable as depending from an allowable independent claim.

Additionally, applicant added new independent claim 35, which recites features similar to those recited in independent claim 9, claim 16, and allowable claim 18. Applicant cancelled

Applicant: Kevin J. Orvek Attorney's Docket No.: 10559-932001 / P18721

Serial No.: 10/814,883 Filed: March 31, 2004

Page : 8 of 8

claim 18. Applicant considers new independent 35 to be allowable as including features indicated allowable by the examiner. Applicant also added new claims 36-41, which recite features similar to those recited in claims 10, 11, 12, 13, 14 and 15, respectively. New claims 36-41 depend from new allowable independent claim 35 and are therefore allowable for at least the same reasons as independent claim 35.

Lastly, applicant cancelled withdrawn claims 19-29.

In view of the foregoing, applicant respectfully submits that the application is in condition for allowance and such action is respectfully requested at the examiner's earliest convenience.

It is believed that all the rejections and/or objections raised by the examiner have been addressed.

All of the dependent claims are patentable for at least the reasons for which the claims on which they depend are patentable.

Canceled claims, if any, have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer.

Any circumstance in which the applicant has (a) addressed certain comments of the examiner does not mean that the applicant concedes other comments of the examiner, (b) made arguments for the patentability of some claims does not mean that there are not other good reasons for patentability of those claims and other claims, or (c) amended or canceled a claim does not mean that the applicant concedes any of the examiner's positions with respect to that claim or other claims.

No fees are believed due. Please apply any other required fees to deposit account 06-1050, referencing the attorney docket number shown above.

Respectfully submitted,

Date:

Ido Rabinovitch

Attorney for Intel Corporation

Reg. No. L0080

Customer No. 20985 Fish & Richardson P.C. Telephone: (617) 542-5070 Facsimile: (617) 542-8906

21534456.doc